



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Monroe Doctrine with outspoken disapproval, and that they have pursued systematically a policy of South American conquest by means of "settlement," but with the "mailed fist" behind it all. They have openly taught that South American land should be settled by Germanic peoples and that others should be "driven into reservations." The Monroe Doctrine has been looked upon not only with contempt but as an "impertinence." Back in 1903 Johannes Vollert wrote: "The inviolability of the American soil is invoked without there being at hand the slightest means of warding off the attack of a respectable European power." Count von Goetzen said: "The Monroe Doctrine will be taken charge of by us." But clearer still and more ominous were the words of Freiherr von Edelsheim: "As a matter of fact, Germany is the only great power which is in a position to conquer the United States."

All such talk made it easy for Germany to fill our land with spies, to attempt to alienate Mexico from us, and to try to embroil us with Japan. We do not have to strain our credulity to believe that Count von Goetzen said that "Germany intends to take a billion or more dollars from New York and other places, and that she will take charge of South America so far as she wants to." She is about the business now. Whatever opinions one may have held prior to April 6, 1917, the fact is that today America is in danger. The Imperial German Government is not only bent upon imposing upon the world a theory of government that is dying and ought to be dead; she is not only threatening American ideals; our very lives are threatened, both out along the Western Line in France and, at this writing, at our very doors. The older order of the rights of kings is battling the new order of the rights of peoples. Now is no time to hide our heads in the sands.

If there is any one in this country who cannot yet sense the tremendous quality of the struggle in which we are engaged—a struggle between forces retrogressive and destructive and forces progressive and creative—at least it is to be hoped that he may use what intelligence he possesses to learn and reflect upon the lesser, but more immediate truth—to him perhaps more powerfully argumentative—that, short of the absolute and final defeat of Prussian autocracy, only two outcomes of this struggle are possible: (1) Either America will find itself facing years of the building up and final outbreak of a second war far more terrible than this one; or (2) That America shall realize the prophecies of von Goetzen and the implications of Vollert.

The human ostrich who at such a time as this buries his worthy head in theological sophistry, and "loves his enemies" to the extent of compacting peace with Prussia, places himself in the ludicrous and intellectually

pitiable position of the traditional "drunk," who recognized whiskey as his "enemy" and therefore "loved it." He is parodying Scripture, betraying himself and his fellowmen, and, whether consciously or not, doing his best to defer, if not to destroy, all hope of either a permanent or an enduring peace.

"GREATLY AND WORTHILY"

WHEN Mr. Wilson, speaking before the Red Cross Meeting in New York, May 25th, said that there are two things facing the American people today, namely, first, that we must win this war, and, second, that we must win it "greatly and worthily," he expressed the situation exactly as it is. We of the American Peace Society grant that we must win this war. More than that, we have done everything we possibly could to help in that process. But the motives at the foundation of the work of the American Peace Society are enabled to live and to bear fruit more especially in the light of the statement that we must win this war greatly and worthily. If only we can make increasingly clear the aims we hold before us as we go forth to war, we shall be rendering a service not only to our military forces but to the cause of reconstruction for which we strive.

We can point out, for example, and with advantage to all the nations arrayed against Mittel-Europa, that the self-aggrandizing spirit of any nation which calls itself the master of all other nations and wills to be supreme in the world is intolerable. The legal rights of small and weak states must not as a matter of course be subordinated to the will of the large and the strong. Monarchs are not commissioned by God to be the interpreters and agents of the Divine will, and to act as if they were is miserable business. If we are to win this war greatly and worthily we must of course remind ourselves of these elementary truths at the foundations of democracies, but above all we must teach them to the enemies arrayed against us. States do not possess unlimited sovereignty, neither are they above moral restraints imposed upon individuals. We must all subscribe to this, Germany included. Even in warfare, barbarities contrary to the rules of the game must not be permitted. The fundamental fact of the State is not power but justice. These simple principles, so little comprehended in Potsdam, need emphasis and re-emphasis until they are so clear that he who runs may read. To state them, clarify them, herald them, will go far toward winning this war greatly and worthily. If the American Peace Society can only rivet the eyes of our determined people upon these vital things so essential to a governed world, we shall all sacrifice together the more intelligently, and therefore the more willingly and

the more effectively. The American Peace Society has a duty clearly before it. And that duty is to leave no means untried to aid our United States and our associated nations to keep the far goal in sight as we go forth to win the war greatly and worthily.

THINKING IT THROUGH

THE League to Enforce Peace held a national convention in Philadelphia, May 16 and 17, choosing for its motto "WIN THE WAR FOR PERMANENT PEACE." The convention was largely attended with, it is said, over 3,500 officially accredited delegates present. The addresses were highly patriotic and sounded a rallying cry against a premature peace. Win the war—make the world safe by the defeat of German militarism—keep the world peaceful by a league of nations, these summarize the views of the speakers and of the convention. We are glad to print elsewhere in these columns some typical utterances of the occasion. ADVOCATE OF PEACE subscribes whole-heartedly to the aims of this convention and believes that the American will to win the war has happily been helped by it.

But there was something lacking in the conferences. We miss from the program any utterance from the President of the United States relative to the League to Enforce Peace or even to its purposes. No diplomats took part in the discussions. So far as we can gather, even the program of the League to Enforce Peace was not mentioned, much less analyzed. No one expressed any sympathy with the British Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Balfour, who on the first day of the Conference, speaking in the House of Commons, had said: "If any representative of any belligerent country desires seriously to lay before us any proposals, we are ready to listen to them." Short shrift was made of all "peace feelers" from out the Central Powers. No credence was given to the negotiations of Prince Sixtus late in the month of March. The experiences at Brest-Litovsk have naturally led the enemies of Germany to suspect the sincerity of any peace terms proposed out of Central Europe; but if Mr. Balfour could discuss the interesting proposal by Prince Sixtus, it would seem proper for any intelligent group of men in this country to discuss it. But more serious from our point of view is the fact that an organization like the League to Enforce Peace could hold such a convention in the City of Brotherly Love and say so many things, most of which were perfectly sound, and yet so little be said about international organization and the future peace of the world.

When it comes to thinking through the present situation the mind of the average American seems to be limited to the view that we must win this war. That,

beyond doubt, is true. Win the war we must. But as the President said in his Red Cross speech in New York, we must win it "greatly and worthily." If we are to win the war greatly and worthily, we must look to the end in view, we must ask what we mean by a League to Enforce Peace, and search our minds for the international facts destined to support or retard it. As Mr. Brailsford says in *The New Republic*, "One cannot get one's thinking done vicariously." It is all right to call the League to Enforce Peace "a two-fisted opponent to pseudo-pacifism as well as militarism," but this statement does not throw any very great amount of light upon the real problems facing world organization at the close of the war. It still remains a serious question how the League to Enforce Peace can possibly operate, what is to become of the nations outside of the League or nations which secede from the League or which, being members of the League, flout it. Unless the gentlemen who propose the League to Enforce Peace can make clear to skeptical States what shall be done under such circumstances, it would be better that the League apply its mind unto these matters.

The time has passed for an organization to confine its propaganda simply to "broadening the interest in the cause of world organization" or to speak vaguely of a permanent peace "guaranteed by a league of nations." It is now time to show to inquiring minds how such a league can operate where two or three signatory powers should violate their pledges, especially if those powers should happen to be powerful. Mr. Brailsford, in the article above-quoted, is well within the facts when he calls attention to the attitude upon these points of the peoples of the European continent as compared with that of the American or Englishman, constantly threatened as are the former by invasion, haunted by suspicions and memories which only in attenuated form reach the British and which we Americans little comprehend. The very word "enforce" arouses questions and differences and memories among them which it is the duty of the League to Enforce Peace to clear away. If England and America stand willing, as Mr. Brailsford says, to "gamble on the success of the League," not so probably do France and Italy. These will see in such a league little prospect of additional security for themselves, remembering the history of the Council of Vienna and the Treaty of Berlin. They will see little hope of any League to Enforce Peace unless some genuine thinking and explanation is forthcoming.

It is charged that if any dangerous power remains outside the League, then the League cannot succeed. As Mr. Brailsford, himself friendly to the idea of the League, writes: "Will continental States all agree to give an absolutely unlimited pledge to fall 'forthwith'